



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ**

I, the undersigned, being an officer duly authorised in accordance with Section 74(1) and (4) of the Deregulation & Contracting Out Act 1994, to sign and issue certificates on behalf of the Comptroller-General, hereby certify that annexed hereto is a true copy of the documents as originally filed in connection with the patent application identified therein.

In accordance with the Patents (Companies Re-registration) Rules 1982, if a company named in this certificate and any accompanying documents has re-registered under the Companies Act 1980 with the same name as that with which it was registered immediately before re-registration save for the substitution as, or inclusion as, the last part of the name of the words "public limited company" or their equivalents in Welsh, references to the name of the company in this certificate and any accompanying documents shall be treated as references to the name with which it is so re-registered.


In accordance with the rules, the words "public limited company" may be replaced by p.l.c., plc, P.L.C. or PLC.

Re-registration under the Companies Act does not constitute a new legal entity but merely subjects the company to certain additional company law rules.

Signed

Q. H. H. H.

Dated 11 July 2003



The
Patent
Office

1/77

Patents Act 1977
Rule 16

28MAY03 E810525-1 D00611
P01/7700 0.00-0312171.2

Request for grant of a patent

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales NP10 8QQ

1.	Your reference	GB920030037GB1		
2.	Patent application number <i>(The Patent Office will fill in this part)</i>	0312171.2		28 MAY 2003
3.	Full name, address and postcode of the or of each applicant <i>(underline all surnames)</i>	INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION Armonk New York 10504 United States of America 519637 001		
	Patents ADP number <i>(if you know it)</i>			
	If the applicant is a corporate body, give the country/state of its incorporation	State of New York United States of America		
4.	Title of the invention	WORKLOAD BALANCING		
5.	Name of your agent <i>(if you have one)</i>	D P Litherland		
	"Address for Service" in the United Kingdom to which all correspondence should be sent <i>(including the postcode)</i>	IBM United Kingdom Limited Intellectual Property Department Hursley Park Winchester Hampshire SO21 2JN		
	Patents ADP number <i>(if you know it)</i>	919006		
6.	If you are declaring priority from one or more earlier patent applications, give the country and the date of filing of the or of each of these earlier applications and <i>(if you know it)</i> the or each application number	Country	Priority App No <i>(if you know it)</i>	Date of filing <i>(day/month/year)</i>
7.	If this application is divided or otherwise derived from an earlier UK application, give the number and the filing date or the earlier application	No of earlier application	Date of filing <i>(day/month/year)</i>	

8. Is a statement of inventorship and of right to grant of a patent required in support of this request? (Answer 'Yes' if:
a) any applicant named in part 3 is not an inventor, or
b) there is an inventor who is not named as an applicant, or
c) any named applicant is a corporate body.) Yes

9. Enter the number of sheets for any of the following items you are filing with this form. Do not count copies of the same document

Continuation sheets of this form

Description 12

Claim(s) 6

Abstract 1

Drawing(s) 2

10. If you are also filing any of the following, state how many against each item.

Priority documents

Translations of priority documents

Statement of inventorship and right to grant of a patent (Patents Form 7/77) 3

Request for preliminary examination and search (Patents Form 9/77)

Request for substantive examination (Patents Form 10/77)

Any other documents (please specify)

11. I/We request the grant of a patent on the basis of this application




Signature

D P Litherland

27 May 2003
Date

12. Name and daytime telephone number of person to contact in the United Kingdom J N Watson
01962 818955



The
Patent
Office

7/77

Patents Act 1977
Rule 15

Statement of inventorship and of right to grant of a patent

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales NP10 8QQ

1. Your reference GB920030037GB1
2. Patent application number
(if you know it) 0312171.2 28 MAY 2003
3. Full name of the or of each applicant INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
4. Title of invention WORKLOAD BALANCING
5. State how the applicant(s) derived the right
from the inventor(s) to be granted a patent By employment and by agreement
6. How many, if any, additional Patents Forms
7/77 are attached to this form?
7. I/We believe that the person(s) named over the page (and
on any extra copies of this form) is/are the inventor(s) of the
invention which the above patent application relates to.

DP Litherland
Signature D P Litherland 27 May 2003
Date
8. Name and daytime telephone number of
person to contact in the United Kingdom J N Watson
Tel: 01962 818955

Enter the full names, addresses and postcodes of the inventors in the boxes and underline the surnames

Emir Jose GARZA
(UK resident)
c/o IBM United Kingdom Limited
Intellectual Property Law
Hursley Park
Winchester
Hampshire SO21 2JN
England

Patents ADP number (if known)

Stephen James HOBSON
(UK resident)
c/o IBM United Kingdom Limited
Intellectual Property Law
Hursley Park
Winchester
Hampshire SO21 2JN
England

Patents ADP number (if known)

If there are more than three inventors, please write their names and addresses on the back of another Patents Form 7/77 and attach it to this form

REMINDER

Have you signed the form?

Patents ADP number (if known)

WORKLOAD BALANCINGFIELD OF THE INVENTION

5 The present invention relates to workload balancing systems and in particular to the creation and termination of server instances which process such systems' work.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

10 Messaging systems such as IBM(R) WebSphere(R) MQ can deliver messages to an input (application) queue of a server program. The server program is then able to remove (read destructively) such messages and action them.

15 It is often a requirement that instances of the server program are created dynamically, as and when needed, in order to maintain some performance objective. For example, a first instance is typically created when there is some work for the instance to do (i.e. a message has been delivered to server's application queue) and additional instances are
20 created when the number in existence is not enough to provide a timely service.

 IBM's WebSphere MQ messaging product provides a facility known as "triggering" which helps to achieve this requirement. In triggering,
25 certain queues are monitored (those designated as "triggered") for particular transitions. These transitions are specified by users and can be, for example, a transition from queue empty to queue not empty.

 When such a transition occurs, a "trigger message" is created
30 containing details of the transition and the trigger message is put onto an initialisation queue. The initiation queue is typically specified by a user as an attribute of a triggered queue.

 By reading trigger messages from initiation queues, special programs
35 known as trigger monitors are able to decide if a new server instance is required to process messages. If a new instance is required, then one is created.

 A problem with this is how to decide if a new server instance is
40 required. Ways to do this include monitoring the extent to which existing server instances are achieving performance targets and monitoring resource utilization by existing server instances.

WebSphere MQ SupportPac™ MA0L (available from
www.ibm.com/software/ts/mqseries/txppacs/ma0l.html) uses queue depth (i.e.
the number of messages on the queue) to decide when to start a new server
instance. (Another example of this can be found in US Patent 5,799,173.)
5 A system using this solution will however react to transient peaks rather
than to actual increases in workload.

For most real-world scenarios, the number of pending service requests
is subject to large short-term fluctuations. For example, one server
10 instance might be processing messages from a queue A. If an application
batches and puts 500 messages to queue A, this sudden increase in work
might cause an additional 5 server instances to be created. The workload
on the queue may then return to a typical rate of 10 messages on the queue
at any one time. In other words, the increase in work is very short term
15 and consequently the newly created 5 server instances are no longer
necessary.

Creation and termination of server instances is costly both in terms
of processing power and time. It is therefore desirable to avoid
20 unnecessary creation of sever instances, whilst optimising the number
necessary for timely processing of an application queue.

(More detail on triggering in a WebSphere MQ environment can be
obtained from WebSphere MQ Application Programming Guide, IBM Publication
25 number SC34-6064.)

There are also alternatives to triggering. For example, the z/OS™
operating system (available from IBM Corporation) provides a Workload
Manager (WLM) which monitors resource utilization (e.g. CPU usage)
30

However it has been determined that queue depth is a far more
accurate method for determining when a new server instance is required.
However queue depth does not take account of transient workload.

35 A system is desired which will react to trends in workload rather
than to random (atypical) fluctuations.

SUMMARY

40 In a first aspect, the present invention provides an apparatus for
workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system comprising: means
for obtaining the average depth of a queue of messages; and means for
controlling the number of server instances retrieving messages from the

queue based on the average queue depth and one or more predetermined thresholds.

5 Note the reference to server instance throughout the specification should be taken to encompass any application processing (retrieving) messages from a queue.

10 Such control is preferably achieved by starting a server instance when the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold (upper limit). Note, the apparatus itself may start a server instance. For example, the apparatus may form part of a queue manager controlling the queue of messages and the functionality to start a server instance may be built into the queue manager. Alternatively the apparatus may request that another entity (such as a trigger monitor or the server itself) start a server instance. In order to request that another entity start a server instance, a trigger message may be placed on an initialisation queue. When such a trigger message is retrieved by the other entity, it causes that entity to start the server instance. The trigger message preferably includes information regarding (i) which server to instantiate; and (ii) which queue (in a system with multiple queues) the newly instantiated server instance should retrieve messages from.

25 Such control preferably is also achieved by terminating (stopping) a server instance when the average queue depth falls below a second predetermined threshold (lower limit).

30 Note, when the first threshold has been reached and a server instance started, the average depth value is preferably reset to a value lower than the first threshold. In this way a number of server instances aren't started simply because a first server instance has taken a while to start retrieving messages and hence the average queue depth hasn't depleted.

35 Similarly, when it is determined that the average queue depth falls below the second threshold and a server instance is terminated, the average depth value is preferably reset to a value higher than the second threshold. In this way too many server instances aren't terminated unnecessarily.

40 Note control is preferably achieved via the ability to start AND stop server instances, however it is not vital that the apparatus can do both.

 There are a number of ways in which termination of a server instance can be achieved. Some illustrative examples are provided:

(i) by spoofing the server instance into believing that there are no more messages on the queue for it to retrieve;

(ii) by spoofing the server instance into believing that a queue manager, controlling the queue, is shutting down;

(iii) by spoofing the server instance into believing that operator intervention has requested that the server instance shutdown; and

(iv) by (explicitly) requesting that the server instance shutdown.

According to the preferred embodiment, at least one of the above means for terminating a server instance is provided.

Note the apparatus itself may be responsible for terminating a server instance. For example, the apparatus may form part of a queue manager controlling the queue. Alternatively the apparatus may request that another entity (such as a trigger monitor or the owning server) terminate the server instance.

Such termination is preferably in response to determining that the average queue depth is below the second lower threshold.

According to a preferred embodiment, it is possible to set a maximum number of instances that can be active, at any one time. This is such that a server's resources are not unduly consumed / so that malfunctioning server instances do not cause an infinite number of server instances to be created.

According to a preferred embodiment, it is possible to set a minimum number of instances that should to be active at any one time. In this way queue throughput is assured.

In one embodiment, the apparatus calculates the queue's average depth. Alternatively the apparatus may be informed by another entity of the queue's average depth (for example, if the apparatus is not local to the queue).

By way of example, a time weighted mean average queue depth may be calculated. In another embodiment an exponentially smoothed average queue depth is calculated.

According to another aspect, the present invention provides an asynchronous messaging system for workload balancing comprising: a queue

comprising messages for processing by at least one server instance; means for obtaining the average depth of the queue of messages; means for controlling the number of server instances for retrieving such messages from the queue based on the average depth of the queue and one or more predetermined thresholds.

According to another aspect, the invention provides a server instance for processing messages from a queue, the server instance comprising: means for obtaining the average depth of the queue of messages; means for controlling the number of additional server instances based on the average depth of the queue and one or more predetermined thresholds.

Preferably the server instance is able to spawn a new server instance when the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold. The server instance is preferably able to terminate an additional server instance when the average depth of the queue is below a second predetermined threshold. (The server instance preferably may even terminate itself. Further the server instance preferably may start itself based on queue depth and a predetermined threshold.)

According to another aspect, the invention provides a method for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system comprising: obtaining the average depth of a queue of messages; and controlling the number of server instances retrieving messages from the queue based on the average queue depth and one or more predetermined thresholds.

According to another aspect, the present invention may be implemented in software.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

A preferred embodiment of the present invention will now be described, by way of example only, and with reference to the following drawings:

Figure 1 illustrates components of a messaging system pertinent to a preferred embodiment of the present invention; and

Figure 2 is a flowchart of the processing conducted in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

With reference to figures 1 and 2, application 10 puts messages to application queue (app Q) 40 (step 100). Application queue 40 is under to control of a queue manager 20 which comprises a monitor 30 for monitoring queue 40 for certain transitions (step 110). When such a transition occurs, monitor 30 places a trigger message (not shown) onto initialisation queue (init Q) 50 (step 120). A trigger monitor 60 has a blocking GET on the initialisation queue (i.e. control will not return to the trigger monitor until it is able to retrieve a trigger message from queue 50). When such a trigger message is placed on queue 50, this is retrieved by trigger monitor 60 at step 130.

A trigger message contains information such as (i) which server to start an instance of; and (ii) which queue to start processing (retrieving) messages from. The trigger monitor uses (i) to start an instance of the appropriate server (step 140) and then passes information pertaining to (ii) to that server instance (step 150). The particular server instance is then able to begin processing messages from the relevant queue (step 160).

Prior to the present invention, typical queue transitions in an asynchronous messaging system monitored for by monitor 30 included:

- i) "First" - from queue empty, to queue not empty
- ii) "Depth" - from queue depth n to queue depth $n+1$; and
- iii) "Every" - every time a new message is placed on a queue.

Dependent upon the queue depth criterion selected for a particular application queue (defined as an attribute during queue setup), the appropriate transition would cause a trigger message to be placed on the initialisation queue 50 for retrieval by trigger monitor 60. (Note, different queues may have a different transition criterion defined.)

However, as previously mentioned, the creation and termination of server instances is costly. Thus it is desirable to optimize the creation and also the termination of server instances

The present invention therefore preferably addresses this by providing an additional criterion for deciding when a new server instance should be created. A similar criterion may be used to determine when a server instance should be terminated.

The present invention preferably uses the average queue depth to decide if the number of server instances should change, and if so, whether

the number should increase (creation of a new server instance), or decrease (termination of an existing server instance). Average queue depth is preferably periodically evaluated and a new server instance is created when the average queue depth exceeds some "high" (upper) threshold value, and an existing server instance is terminated when the average queue depth drops below some "low" (lower) threshold value. This criterion may be defined (in the usual way) as an attribute of a queue at setup. (Note, triggering criterion may be satisfied due to fresh messages on the queue or due to a transaction backing out.)

Use of average queue depth to determine when to create a new server instance reduces the number of trigger messages placed on an initialisation queue (compared with trigger "Every").

By using such criteria, a messaging system is able to react to long-term trends rather than reacting to a random (short-term) situation fluctuation.

One very simple illustrative way of calculating the average queue depth is to measure the queue depth at one second intervals, for one hundred seconds. The one hundred queue depths measured can then be summed and the total summation divided by one hundred (time weighted mean). To continually update the average, the oldest queue depth can be discarded and a new value measured. The average can then be recalculated.

The average queue depth can then be used to determine when to trigger a new server instance. For example, it may be decided that there should never be an average greater than 4 messages on the queue at any one time. In this case, an average queue depth exceeding 4 would cause a new server instance to be created.

It should be appreciated that the use of a time weighted mean average is not the preferred solution since calculation of such an average is relatively heavy on storage.

A more preferable solution is the use of an exponentially smoothed average as a mechanism for creating new server instances/terminating server instances. In the preferred embodiment, the average queue depth is evaluated at fixed time intervals using the exponential smoothing formula:

$$A_{N+1} = (W * D_N) + ((1-W) * A_N)$$

Where A_N is the average queue depth over the previous x intervals at time N , D_N is the instantaneous queue depth at time N and W is a weighting

factor between 0 and 1. If A_{N+1} is greater than T_H (a predefined upper threshold limit), then a new server instance is created. If A_{N+1} is less than T_L (a predefined lower threshold limit), then an existing server instance is terminated (assuming that one exists).

The preferred weighting factor is 1/16. The formula can then be implemented as:

$$A_{N+1} = 1/16 * D_N + 15/16 * A_N = (D_N + 15 * A_N) / 16$$

According to a preferred embodiment, immediately after starting or stopping a server instance, the average depth A_{N+1} is reset to $(T_H + T_L)/2$. It will be appreciated that this value is halfway between the low and the high thresholds. To illustrate the reason for doing this, suppose the average queue depth exceeded the upper threshold and consequently a server instance was started. There will be a short delay before the server instance starts getting messages. Thus at the next interval, the average queue depth may still be high and thus another instance may be started needlessly. If the system had waited a short time for the new server instance to start getting messages, the average would have gone down. Resetting the average gives time for the new server instance to start getting messages. The same applies to stopping instances. Without resetting the average, too many instances may be stopped, only for the system to have to start them again shortly afterwards. Note, whilst the halfway value is preferred any value between the upper and lower threshold should work.

Parameters such as how often to measure queue depth and also how many samples to measure are preferably not user configurable. Tests will preferably have been conducted to decide what values should be fixed. The values chosen will determine how quickly the system reacts to a change in queue depth. For example, 1 million samples will mean that an instantaneous change in queue depth (perhaps due to a batch of 500 messages being placed on the queue) will make little difference. Further, sampling too often will waste processing power and will mean that the system will react too quickly to transient peaks in workload. On the other hand, sampling too infrequently will mean that the system typically reacts too slowly for the majority of users. Thus the fixing of appropriate values is a fine balance.

It is believed by the inventors that sampling queue depth every 0.2 seconds and also the use of 16 samples to calculate the average is a good metric. (Computers are particularly fast at dividing by sixteen (or any other power of 2))

Note, it has been determined by the inventors that the once appropriate values have been fixed, changes in workload should make little difference as to the ability of the system in processing messages efficiently. In other words the number of server instances created/terminated using such a mechanism should be appropriate for the majority of workloads.

In order to terminate a server instances, a number of solutions are possible:

- 1) One way is to "lie" to a server instance. A server instance will typically attach to an application queue in order to retrieve a message therefrom. The server instance will typically abort after a predetermined period of time (e.g. 10 seconds) if it sees no messages on the application queue after that time has elapsed. The queue manager, in one embodiment, lies to a server instance and informs it that there are no messages to process on the application queue. In this way, the server instance is shut down;
- 2) Another solution is to provide a return code to the server instance informing it (erroneously) that the queue manager is shutting down. This will also cause the server instance to shutdown.
- 3) Another solution is to (erroneously) inform the server instance that the operator has asked that it shutdown; and
- 4) An alternative solution is for the queue manager to incorporate a specific shutdown function which it could call when a lower threshold is reached.

It will be appreciated that the above are only examples of the way in which termination of server instances could be achieved. These solutions are particularly advantageous however since they do not require any modification at the server-end.

In one embodiment, a server instance is created/terminated by the trigger monitor 60. (Note, the invention preferably does not require any modification to the trigger monitor. This is particularly useful since these are typically customer-written)

In order to create/terminate a server instance, the entity doing the creation/termination has to understand how to initiate the creation/termination. As previously alluded to, trigger monitors are typically written by customers. They are typically written in such a way

as to be able to start those customers' servers. A trigger monitor written by a customer to start an instance of that customer's server A, should understand what is necessary in order to achieve the desired act. Thus use of the trigger monitor to create/terminate a server instance is the simplest solution.

However it would also be possible for the queue manager itself (e.g. monitor 30) to create/terminate server instances. This solution is more difficult to program since for it to be effective, the queue manager requires the intelligence to start and stop instances of servers written by a number of different customers. One advantage of this solution however is that a trigger monitor will no longer be necessary.

According to the preferred embodiment, there is preferably also a maximum number of server instances that may be started. Different maximums may be applied to different servers and their instances and may be dynamically configurable by users.

Use of a maximum may be useful for a number of reasons:

- 1) A server may have limited resources; and/or
- 2) A trigger monitor may be creating instances of a server and those instances may be malfunctioning. Without a maximum, more and more malfunctioning server instances could be created which would unnecessarily consume resources.

According to the preferred embodiment, there is also a minimum number of server instances. This is because starting up a server instance is a timely business. Thus it is desirable that there are always enough server instances to keep the queue moving (maybe at least one server instance).

Three exemplary ways of implementing this are:

- 1) Start the minimum number of server instances when the queuing system starts;
- 2) Start the minimum number of server instances when the first message arrives to the application queue; or
- 3) Let the number of server instances increase as the workload increases, but when the workload decreases do not drop below the specified minimum.

US Patent 5,799,173 uses a parameter to decide between options 1 and 2. In a preferred embodiment option 1 is chosen because most users who specify a minimum number of servers do so because they cannot tolerate the delay in starting new servers.

In the preferred embodiment, the queue manager abstains from putting another trigger message onto the initiation queue if the number of server instances reaches a defined maximum. It also abstains from terminating a server instance if that meant the number of server instances would drop below a defined minimum. This has the advantage that the trigger monitor remains unmodified and continues to receive its instructions from the init Q.

It will be appreciated that whilst the present invention has been described in terms of triggering (via a trigger monitor and trigger messages), no such limitation is intended. The invention is preferably applicable to any workload balancing asynchronous messaging system needing to determine when to create a new server instance for processing of work/when to terminate a server instance.

Rather than use a trigger monitor to create/terminate a server instance alternative solutions are possible. For example:

- i) The queue manager may create/terminate server instances (see earlier) - in which case no trigger monitor is necessary
- ii) The functionality may be built into a workload manager such as that provided by WLM.
- iii) The functionality may be built into the servers themselves such that the server creates instances of itself based on average queue depth.

Regarding ii) and iii), information regarding average queue depth may be passed to WLM/server from the queue manager.

The term queue depth has been used herein to mean the number of messages on the queue.

To summarise, the present invention relates to an apparatus, method and computer program for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system. The number of server instances, which retrieve messages from a queue of messages, is controlled based upon that queue's average queue depth rather than the queue's instantaneous queue depth. In this way it is

possible for a system making use of the present invention to react to trends in workload, rather than reacting to random (atypical) workloads.

CLAIMS

1. Apparatus for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system comprising:

means for obtaining the average depth of a queue of messages; and

means for controlling the number of server instances retrieving messages from the queue based on the average queue depth and one or more predetermined thresholds.

2. The apparatus of claim 1 comprising:

means, responsive to determining that the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold, for starting another server instance for retrieving messages from the queue.

3. The apparatus of claim 1 comprising:

means, responsive to determining that the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold, for requesting that another entity start a server instance for retrieving messages from the queue.

4. The apparatus of claim 3, wherein the controlling means comprises:

means for placing a trigger message on an initialisation queue, the trigger message being destined for the other entity, the trigger message indicating to the other entity that a server instance is to be started.

5. The apparatus of claim 4, wherein the apparatus is for use in a messaging system having a plurality of queues and the trigger message includes information regarding (i) which server to instantiate; and (ii) which queue the newly instantiated server instance should retrieve messages from.

6. The apparatus of claim 2 comprising:

means, responsive to determining that the first threshold has been exceeded, for resetting the average queue depth to less than the first threshold.

7. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the means for controlling the number of server instances comprises:

means for terminating a server instance when the average queue depth falls below a second predetermined threshold.

8. The apparatus of claim 7 comprising:

means, responsive to determining that the average queue depth is below the second threshold, for resetting the average queue depth to be greater than the second threshold.

9. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the means for terminating a server instance comprises at least one of:

(i) means for spoofing the server instance into believing that there are no more messages on the queue for it to process;

(ii) means for spoofing the server instance into believing that a queue manager, controlling the queue, is shutting down;

(iii) means for spoofing the server instance into believing that operator intervention has requested that the server instance shuts down; and

(iv) means for requesting that the server instance shuts down.

10. The apparatus of claims 7, wherein the means for terminating a server instance comprises:

means for requesting that another entity terminate the server instance.

11. The apparatus of claim 1 comprising:

means for setting a maximum number of server instances that can be active at any one time.

12. The apparatus of claim 1, comprising:

means for setting a minimum number of server instances that should be active at any one time.

13. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the means for obtaining the average queue depth comprises:

means for calculating the queue's average depth.

14 The apparatus of claim 13 wherein the means for calculating comprises:

means for calculating a time weighted mean average queue depth.

15. The apparatus of claim 13, wherein the means for calculating comprises:

means for calculating an exponentially smoothed average queue depth.

16. An asynchronous messaging system for workload balancing comprising:

a queue comprising messages for processing by at least one server instance;

means for obtaining the average depth of the queue of messages;

means for controlling the number of server instances for retrieving such messages from the queue based on the average depth of the queue and one or more predetermined thresholds.

17. A server instance for processing messages from a queue, the server instance comprising:

means for obtaining the average depth of the queue of messages;

means for controlling the number of additional server instances based on the average depth of the queue and one or more predetermined thresholds.

18. The server instance of claim 17, wherein the controlling means comprises:

means for spawning an additional server instance when the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold.

19. The server instance of claim 17, wherein the controlling means comprises:

means for terminating an additional server instance when the average depth of the queue falls below a second predetermined threshold.

20. A method for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system comprising:

obtaining the average depth of a queue of messages; and

controlling the number of server instances retrieving messages from the queue based on the average queue depth and one or more predetermined thresholds.

21. The method of claim 20 comprising:

responsive to determining that the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold, starting another server instance for retrieving messages from the queue.

22. The method of claim 20 comprising:

responsive to determining that the average queue depth exceeds a first predetermined threshold, for requesting that another entity start a server instance for retrieving messages from the queue.

23. The method of claim 22, wherein the controlling step comprises:

placing a trigger message on an initialisation queue, the trigger message being destined for the other entity, the trigger message indicating to the other entity that a server instance is to be started.

24. The method of claim 23, wherein the method is for use in a messaging system having a plurality of queues and the trigger message includes information regarding (i) which server to instantiate; and (ii) which queue the newly instantiated server instance should retrieve messages from.

25. The method of claim 21 comprising:

responsive to determining that the first threshold has been exceeded, resetting the average queue depth to less than the first threshold.

26. The method of claim 20, wherein the controlling step:

terminating a server instance when the average queue depth falls below a second predetermined threshold.

27. The method of claim 26 comprising:

responsive to determining that the average queue depth is below the second threshold, resetting the average queue depth to be greater than the second threshold.

28. The method of claim 26, wherein the step of terminating a server instance comprises at least one of:

5 (i) spoofing the server instance into believing that there are no more messages on the queue for it to process;

(ii) spoofing the server instance into believing that a queue manager, controlling the queue, is shutting down;

10 (iii) spoofing the server instance into believing that operator intervention has requested that the server instance shuts down; and

(iv) requesting that the server instance shuts down.

15 29. The method of claim 26, wherein the step of terminating a server instance comprises:

requesting that another entity terminate the server instance.

20 30. The method of claim 20 comprising:

setting a maximum number of server instances that can be active at any one time.

25 31. The method of claim 20, comprising:

setting a minimum number of server instances that should be active at any one time.

30 32. The method of claim 20, wherein the step of obtaining the average queue depth comprises:

calculating the queue's average depth.

35 33. The method of claim 32 wherein the step of calculating comprises:

calculating a time weighted mean average queue depth.

34. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of calculating comprises:

40 calculating an exponentially smoothed average queue depth.

35. A computer program for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system, the computer program comprising program code means adapted to perform the steps of:

5 obtaining the average depth of a queue of messages; and

 controlling the number of server instances retrieving messages from the queue based on the average queue depth and one or more predetermined thresholds.

10

ABSTRACT**WORKLOAD BALANCING**

5 The present invention relates to an apparatus, method and computer
program for workload balancing in an asynchronous messaging system. The
number of server instances, which process work items from a queue of
messages, is controlled based upon that queue's average queue depth and one
or more predetermined thresholds.




Figure 1






Figure 2

